

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 10, 11, 16, 20, and 21 have been amended as shown on pages 2-6 of the Reply. Claims 2, 8, 9, and 18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7-8, 11, 13, 16-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3, 7-8, 11, 13, and 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dahlman *et al.* (U.S. 6,526,039). Independent claims 1, 16, 20, and 21 now incorporate elements from dependent claims 2, 8, and 9 that the Examiner has cited as being allowable on page 7 of the Office Action. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Dahlman *et al.* does not disclose or suggest each and every aspect set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The *identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

The subject claims relate to reducing wireless communication search time using known scrambling code offsets. The claimed invention creates search results by correlating a received signal with a synchronization sequence and then reduces the number of search results by removing results whose offset is within a threshold of a stored offset. The claimed invention also stores a plurality of scrambling code identifiers and correlates the received signal with a scrambling code over a search window to produce a list search result. Moreover, scrambling code identifiers are removed from the plurality of scrambling code identifiers when the list search result exceeds a pre-determined threshold. To this end, claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 16, 20, and 21) recites *wherein the processor further removes a scrambling*

code identifier from the second plurality of scrambling code identifiers when the list search result exceeds a pre-determined threshold.

Dahlman *et al.* does not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel features as recited in the subject claims. Examiner concedes this point on page 7 of the Office Action. Although Dahlman *et al.* discloses a system for facilitating the timing of base stations. (Abstract). Dahlman *et al.* does not disclose searching a window around an offset associated with a correlated set of search results using a list of one or more scrambling codes and removing a scrambling code identifier from the list when a pre-determined threshold is exceeded. Conventional systems maintain relative time difference estimation tables to estimate search offsets but do not remove search results whose offset is within a threshold of a stored offset and remove a scrambling code identifier from a list search result. Thus, disclosed novel aspects reduce the search time for neighboring cells during search mode over conventional systems.

In view of the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Dahlman *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 1, 16, 20, and 21 (and claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 13, 17, and 18 that depend there from), and thus fails to anticipate the subject claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 4-6, 12, 14, and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4-6, 12, 14, and 15 respectively stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahlman *et al.* in view of various secondary references. Withdrawal of these rejections is requested for at least the following reason. The subject claims depend from independent claim 1 and the respective secondary references do not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Dahlman *et al.* with respect to this claim.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 170026.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Milan Patel
Reg. No. 41,242

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone (858) 658-5787
Facsimile (858) 658-2502